

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/765,258	01/26/2004	Randy S. Beals	706501US2	9583
24938	7590 11/17/2004		EXAMINER	
DAIMLER CIMS 483-0		ECTUAL CAPITAL CORPORATION	IP, SIKYIN	
800 CHRYS	LER DR EAST		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
AUBURN H	IILLS, MI 48326-2757		1742	
	•		DATE MAILED: 11/17/2004	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	- A
		10/765,258	BEALS, RANDY S.	,
Office Action Summary		Examiner	Art Unit	
		Sikyin Ip	1742	
The MAILING DATE of a	his communication app		rith the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS - Extensions of time may be available und after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing - If the period for reply specified above is - If NO period for reply is specified above - Failure to reply within the set or extende Any reply received by the Office later the earned patent term adjustment. See 37	S COMMUNICATION. Ier the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 date of this communication. Iess than thirty (30) days, a reply the maximum statutory period w d period for reply will, by statute, an three months after the mailing	36(a). In no event, however, may a within the statutory minimum of thin ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed rty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this communic BANDONED (35 U.S.C. 8 133)	cation.
Status				
	2b)⊡ This in condition for allowar	action is non-final.	ters, prosecution as to the meri	ts is
Disposition of Claims				
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-9</u> is/are pend 4a) Of the above claim(s 5)☐ Claim(s) is/are all 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-9</u> is/are rejec 7)☐ Claim(s) is/are ob 8)☐ Claim(s) are subj) is/are withdraw owed. ted. ijected to.			
Application Papers				
	is/are: a) acce that any objection to the c tt(s) including the correction	epted or b) objected to Irawing(s) be held in abeyar on is required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). (s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.12	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
12) Acknowledgment is made a) All b) Some * c) 1. Certified copies of 2. Certified copies of 3. Copies of the certi	None of: the priority documents the priority documents fied copies of the priori e International Bureau	have been received. have been received in A ty documents have been (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Stage	
Attachment(s)				
Notice of References Cited (PTO-89) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Draw Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Draw Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Draw Notice of References Cited (PTO-89) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Draw Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Draftsperson's Pat	ring Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s	summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-152) 	ı

Application/Control Number: 10/765,258

Art Unit: 1742

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3 and 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by USP 4997622 to Regazzoni et al (test no. 7). It is noted in col. 1, lines 18-21 of said reference that presence of Ca would have 0.1-0.6 wt.% Si impurity.

The other claimed elements such as Sn, Zn, and REM are considered as optional elements since their contents include zero.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The factual inquiries set forth in Graham v. John Deere Co., 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation

Application/Control Number: 10/765,258

Art Unit: 1742

under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 4-5 and 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over USP 4997622 to Regazzoni et al (col. 1, lines 5-25), or

Regazzoni discloses the features including the claimed Mg based alloy compositions. When prior art compounds essentially "bracketing" the claimed compounds in structural similarity are all known, one of ordinary skill in the art would clearly be motivated to make those claimed compounds in searching for new products in the expectation that compounds similar in structure will have similar properties. In re Gyurik, 596 F.2d 1012, 1018, 201 USPQ 552, 557 (CCPA 1979); See In re May, 574 F.2d 1082, 1094, 197 USPQ 601, 611 (CCPA 1978) and In re Hoch, 57 CCPA 1292, 1296, 428 F.2d 1341, 1344, 166 USPQ 406, 409 (1970). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to select any portion of range, including the claimed range, from the broader range disclosed in a prior art reference because the prior art reference finds that the prior art composition in the entire disclosed range has a suitable utility. Also see MPEP § 2131.03 and § 2123.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed September 2, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Art Unit: 1742

Applicants argue that alloy of Regazzoni does not contain Si. Applicants' attention is directed to col. 1, lines 18-21 which discloses

Ca: 0-7%

but always with the presence of zinc and/or calcium, having the following content of impurities:

Si: 0.1-0.6

20

Applicants argue that test 12 of Regazzoni requires MnO. But, test 7 does not.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

The above rejection relies on the reference(s) for all the teachings expressed in the text(s) of the references and/or one of ordinary skill in the metallurgical art would have reasonably understood or implied from the text(s) of the reference(s). To emphasize certain aspect(s) of the prior art, only specific portion(s) of the text(s) have been pointed out. Each reference as a whole should be reviewed in responding to the rejection, since other sections of the same reference and/or various combination of the cited references may be relied on in future rejection(s) in view of amendment(s).

All recited limitations in the instant claims have been meet by the rejections as set forth above.

Applicant is reminded that when amendment and/or revision is required, applicant should therefore specifically point out the support for any amendments made to the disclosure. See 37 C.F.R. § 1.121.

Examiner Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to S. Ip whose telephone number is (571) 272-1241. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 5:30 A.M. to 2:00 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dr. Roy V. King, can be reached on (571)-272-1244.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SIKYIN IP PRIMARY EXAMINER ART UNIT 1742

S. Ip November 15, 2004